DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 165 SP 007 891

AUTHOR	Rosner, Benjamin
TITLE	The British Teacher Center: A Report on its Development, Current Operations, Effects and Applicability to Teacher Education in the U.S.
PUB DATE	Nov 72
NOTE	34p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Study Centers; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Centers; *Teacher Education; Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

This report offers a description of the development and current status of the British teacher center as a vehicle for in-service teacher education and curriculum reform in the primary and secondary schools of the United Kingdom. In addition, the report examines the applicability of the British teacher center model to American teacher education and school reform. The British teacher center is a facility providing space, materials, and equipment in which a) teachers engage in curriculum planning and development activity and receive instruction pertinent to the design, development, and implementation of primary and secondary school curricula; b) the products of local and national curriculum development activities are exhibited; and c) teachers convene for purposes of relaxation and refreshment. The centers serve approximately 1,000 teachers and are located to afford teachers easy access during or after school hours. A number of full-time and part-time staff are employed for the purposes of administration, instruction, technical assistance, secretarial/clerical assistance, and custodial care. The budget is provided by the local school district from public funds; the centers are governed by an advisory committee including teachers, school administrators, college and university faculty, and teacher center administrative staff. Teacher participation in the center program is voluntary. This report concludes that the British teacher center model has relevance for American school reform and teacher education. (DDO)

ED 090165

The British Teacher Center: A Report on its Development, Current Operations, Effects and Applicability to Teacher Education in the U.S.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Benjamin Rosner

Office of Teacher Education

The City University of New York

November, 1972

SP 007 891

The British Teacher Center

by Benjamin Rosner*

This report offers a description of the development and current status of the British teacher center as a vehicle for inservice teacher education and curriculum reform in the primary and secondary schools of the United Kingdom. In addition, the report examines the applicability of the British teacher center model to American teacher education and school reform.

The report is based on a number of meetings with teacher center wardens, university faculty, Local Education Authority (LEA) officials and classroom teachers. It is also based upon visits to nine teacher centers and attendance at a Conference on Teacher Centers sponsored by the National Union of Teachers. The meetings and observations occurred during the two week period October 6 - 19, 1972. (See Appendix A and B)

Considering the size and significance of the British teacher center movement, considering the many hundreds of teacher centers now in operation, the hundreds of wardens directing teacher center activity, the thousands of teachers affected by center programs, and the variability which characterizes English education in general and teacher centers in particular, the period of observation and the observational samples are much too small to offer anything more than hypotheses about either the current status or future prospects of teacher centers in the United Kingdom. The report is best read, therefore, as the observations of one American educator who had much to learn during his visit and much more to consider upon his return.

I. History and Current Status

Although the stimulus for large scale expansion of the British teacher center movement may be attributed to the 1967 Schools Council Working Paper #10[1], the seed of teacher center activity was sown earlier by a variety of curriculum development projects, most notably, the Nuffield projects in mathematics and science. These curriculum projects demanded a network of stations to serve field testing (and

*The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Mrs. Frieda Rosner, Richmond College, in the collection and interpretation of data relating to the description of teacher centers in the United Kingdom.

teacher training) requirements. Accordingly, when the need for teacher centers to offer inservice teacher education was expressed in Schools Council Working Paper #10, the curriculum centers which had been established to serve Nuffield projects emerged as the prototypes of teacher center facilities. The earliest centers, therefore, were those designed to promote linkages between national curriculum reform efforts on the one hand, and school-based teacher training and materials assessment procedures on the other. It is no accident, therefore, that teacher center leadership is oriented to curriculum change through materials development and inservice teacher education.

In addition to the Nuffield curriculum projects, two other educational developments with profound curriculum implications stimulated the spread of teacher centers. The first was the Plowden report[2] encouraging major reform in early childhood education, and the second, a national mandate to raise the school leaving age from fifteen to sixteen.[3] [4] These latter developments to overhaul British primary and secondary education had to engage the efforts of Local Education Authorities (LEA) in the design of new school structures, curricula, and materials. It was natural, therefore, for LEAs to turn to the Schools Council teacher center model as the vehicle for local curriculum reform and inservice teacher education. At the present time there are approximately 500 teacher centers distributed throughout England and Wales. (A listing of teacher centers, wardens, and LEA liaison officers as of May, 1972 is available from Schools Council.)[5]

Despite the fact that curriculum reform movements stimulated the establishment of teacher centers, the rationale for LEA support is more easily understood by recognizing several factors which shape the character and flavor of British education. Perhaps the most important aspect of English primary and secondary education is the decentralization of curriculum authority to the auspices of school

headmasters or head teachers. The headmaster or headmistress of a primary or secondary school is fully responsible for the school curriculum. Although a school district may attempt to influence the "head's" point of view, the school's program reflects the "head's" wishes or emphases. Curriculum reform, therefore, is not a matter of administrative imposition but rather a matter of administrative encouragement and persuasion. Moreover, teachers reappointed after a one-year probationary period, also enjoy a high degree of curricular autonomy. (The elimination of the 11 + examination has strengthened teacher curriculum control.) As a consequence, curriculum reform needs to be "sold," and the "selling price" is full teacher participation in the development and implementation of new curricula.

A second factor which reinforces teacher independence is the elimination of the inspectorial function of both Her Majesty's Inspectors and LEA advisors. Inspectors are now advisors and their function is advisory. Although advisors enjoy status and salary equivalent to former Inspectors, they fulfill their mission through inservice education rather than administrative edict. Teacher centers, therefore, offer advisors a mechanism for inservice education - a major factor in LEA support of local teacher centers.

Finally, it is important to recognize the role and image of the English college of education in the preparation of teachers. To date, colleges of education in England have restricted their function to preservice teacher education. Although colleges have offered some courses for experienced teachers, the inservice function has been regarded as tangential to their preservice mission. Moreover, the college of education three-year, non-degree program is subject to the academic review of a "sponsoring" university. Whether to satisfy internal (college) academic criteria, or whether to satisfy external (university) academic criteria, the college preservice program has tended to stress educational theory rather than educational practice. Teachers, therefore, seem to regard the college of education curriculum as irrelevant. Further, although college of education faculty are frequently

recruited from school ranks, teachers perceive college faculty as out-of-touch with current school problems and insensitive to teacher needs. For these reasons, teachers advocate the establishment of independent centers under teacher control. In summary, then, the curricular autonomy of school "heads," the advisory role of the former LEA Inspector and the poor image of colleges of education have contributed to the development of LEA supported teacher centers more or less under teacher control.

This brief outline of the history of the teacher center movement would be incomplete without attention to the current educational scene. Two factors are particularly worth noting - the James Report[6] and the imminent reorganization of school district boundaries.

The James Report was prepared for the Secretary of State for Education and Science in 1971 and published in 1972. It presents the conclusions of a Committee of Inquiry into the "present arrangements for the education, training and probation of teachers in England and Wales...."

Briefly stated, the report recommends establishing teacher education on a three-cycle pattern. The first cycle, of approximately two years' length, would be concerned with general education; the second cycle, also of two years' length, would be devoted to professional teacher education, with the first year (year three in the sequence) dedicated to theory and methodology, and the second year (year four in the sequence) to apprentice teaching in the schools. The third cycle would continue indefinitely and would be dedicated to upgrading or extending the skills of inservice teachers. James regards Cycle III as most critical and the report argues its high priority.

To accommodate the general education requirements of Cycle I, colleges of education would be transformed to multi-purpose colleges, i.e., they would expand

their capabilities in the humanities, the social sciences, and the physical and other sciences proper. To accommodate the professional teacher education provisions of Cycle II and the continuing education function of Cycle III, colleges would develop closer working relationships with LEAs and would establish "professional centers." In effect, the James report focuses on the reform of colleges of education so that they would assume increasing responsibility for the full scope of preservice and inservice teacher education. The colleges would continue, however, to work closely with universities for the complete implementation of their programs. Although the report mentions "teacher centers," the term is not retained to designate the agency with responsibility for the continuing education of teachers. Instead a new term, "professional centers," is coined. It is clear that teacher center directors regard the change in terminology as deliberate and are concerned about their futures and the future of teacher centers.

The "threat" of the James Report is, of course, purely speculative, for governmental reaction is uncertain. The threat of school district reorganization, however, is real, for plans to redistrict LEAs by 1974 are under way. While the 1974 LEA reorganization does not challenge the general concept or function of teacher centers, the support or existence of specific teacher centers will be a function of newly created LEAs. It is possible that some teacher centers will be terminated and others initiated, depending upon their geographic dispersion in the newly created districts. District reorganization, therefore, threatens the stability of current teacher center operations. It seems reasonable to note that while the teacher center movement gained momentum during the period 1967-1971, the movement has now crested, and its future is somewhat uncertain.

II. Characteristics of the British Teacher Centers

Before attempting to describe the common characteristics and functions of British teacher centers, it is necessary to underscore two major points. First,

there is considerable variability among teacher centers in both characteristics and function. Second, a large measure of this variability is attributable to the ability and temperament of the teacher centers warden (director). Given these caveats, it is possible to identify some common features and roles, but diversity must always be kept in mind. (It should be noted that the individuality of each center is a mark of pride among wardens, for the centers reflect the variability and individuality of British life in general and British education in particular. It should also be noted that there is not yet available a definitive description of teacher center operations, although the National Union of Teachers has conducted one survey.(7) The Schools Council also attempts to keep abreast of center activity, and a Master of Philosophy thesis on teacher centers has recently been completed and is likely to be published.)(8)

A. Facilities

The teacher center is first and foremost a place, although its size varies from part-time occupancy of a single administrative office (in rural areas) to full-time occupancy of a converted primary school or other building (in cities and suburbs). The urban-rural difference obtains particularly in regard to space, personnel, budget, facilities and equipment and is a major concern of teacher centers wardens.

Typically, a city or suburban center includes one or two administrative offices, a reception area and/or lounge for teachers and visitors, kitchen facilities, two or three seminar or conference rooms, a lecture hall (at least one room to accommodate 50 or more people), a teacher's library, other space for the display of curricular materials, and some space set aside for duplicating and audio-visual equipment. Depending upon warden and/or teacher initiative and LEA support, some centers contain workshops for the preparation of instructional equipment, photography laboratories, libraries for teacher education materials and school materials, rooms for

special subject laboratories (science, mathematics, art, home economics, etc.) and additional social facilities including bars. The major determinant of center facilities and program, beyond teacher and/or warden interest and entrepreneurial skill, is floor space.

B. Staff

The teacher center staff ranges in size from one part-time professional (warden) to, in one instance, eight full-time professional, technical, clerical and housekeeping personnel. Typically, a center staff includes a full-time warden, a full-time or part-time secretary, a full-time or part-time deputy warden, and the part-time services of custodial or housekeeping personnel who may also serve in the kitchen during peak hours of the day, usually after school and in the evenings. Some centers employ full-time or part-time shop teachers, audio-visual technicians and additional clerical staff. Wardens also have access to the part-time consultant services of curriculum specialists, media specialists, librarians and other personnel available within the LEA. In addition, wardens may acquire needed consultant services from outside the LEA, e.g., from colleges and universities, from government agencies, from business and industry, or from the community at large. Although the full-time staff of a teacher center tends to be limited to a warden, possibly a deputy warden and secretary, center access to LEA personnel is restricted only by time, while center access to external (non-LEA) personnel is constrained by available funds.

C. Materials and Equipment

Although center materials and equipment vary widely as a function of space, money, and need, most centers usually possess duplicating equipment (differing in quality and kind), audio-visual equipment (also differing in quality and kind), shelves, filing cabinets, and closets for the storage of books and other curricular materials, general office furniture and equipment, kitchen utensils and hardware, comfortable lounge chairs, folding or stacking chairs, and display equipment. Some

centers also possess woodworking and electrical shop equipment, photographic equipment, desk calculating equipment, arts and crafts materials (easels, kilns, etc.) and bar facilities and equipment. In general, although the materials and equipment acquired for the exclusive use of the center may be limited, centers also have access to LEA materials and equipment on a loan basis.

D. Budget

Teacher centers are funded by their Local Education Authorities, with wardens enjoying greater or lesser control over expenditures. All personnel, space, facilities, materials and equipment are paid for by the LEA. The budget for day-to-day operations, excluding permanent center staff, seems to range between $2,000 and $8,000 per year, however these figures are based on a few self-reports and are not dependable. Financial flexibility is generated by wardens with a variety of skills and insights. Some centers acquire income from commercial publishers in exchange for the production and distribution rights to materials and equipment developed in the center. Some wardens purchase materials through the LEA, obtaining discounted bulk rates. In a few centers, teachers may pay a fee for the use of center facilities for personal reasons; e.g., dinners and parties. All centers require teachers to cover the cost of tea, coffee and bar services. On occasion, centers and colleges of education which have close working relationships share acquisitions of materials to extend their budgetary flexibility. Generally speaking, centers have limited budgets, but do have opportunities to augment purchasing power. Much depends upon the ability and sensitivity of the warden and the limits of discretionary authority vested in him by the LEA.

Because the major, if not only, funding agency is the LEA, centers compete for funds with other programs and units supported by the school district. An interesting aspect of this competition is the fact that colleges of education are also funded by (or through) the LEAs. If the James Report recommendation to establish Professional

Centers under the jurisdiction of colleges of education is implemented, it is possible that current LEA teacher center funds will be partially, if not wholly, diverted to support Professional Centers - a cause of concern among wardens and, perhaps, of LEA advisors.

E. Governance

Although wardens are responsible for the administration of the teacher center budget, the formation of policy and regulations governing budgetary expenditures varies. In some instances, wardens require the approval of an advisor to whom they are directly responsible. In other instances, wardens hold advisor rank and in these circumstances have greater budgetary authority. In a few instances, the required approval of an LEA officer is pro forma. Much depends upon the bargaining power and status of the warden at the time of his initial appointment.

Typically, the warden enjoys considerable freedom of action, although each center tends to have an advisory committee to assist in formulating center policies and procedures. The membership of most advisory committees includes teachers, representatives of the LEA, representatives of colleges and universities, and the warden. The power of the advisory committee and the degree of teacher control varies from center to center. In some centers a formal constitution defines the membership and functions of the advisory committee (management board), the responsibility and authority of the warden, and the relationship between them. These constitutions seems to assert teacher control over center operations. (See Appendix C) In other centers, advisory committees function as channels of communication between the warden and teachers. In a few centers, the warden (or his LEA superior) runs the center, attending to teacher requests as they are sought out or made known through informal channels. Although wardens agree that centers exist for teachers and should be teacher controlled, the degree of teacher control varies and no evidence is available to suggest that one degree of teacher control or another

is more effective - either in the number of programs or projects conducted, or in the number of teachers attending center activities. Studies examining the relationship between different forms of teacher center governance - different degrees of teacher control - and teacher participation in center programs and/or improvements in teacher competence would be extremely useful.

III. The Warden

There is little doubt that the success or failure of a teacher center rests in the hands of the warden. Wardens vary in their training and experience, their personal style of leadership, and their specific interests, abilities and aspirations. Accordingly, wardens place different degrees of emphasis on various roles and allocate their time and energy to different educational management functions.

Wardens are appointed by LEAs, usually from the ranks of head teachers or advisors, although some wardens are recruited from senior teacher ranks. The problem to be solved in a warden's appointment is the selection of a person who enjoys not only sufficiently high status or influence within the LEA, but also the confidence of classroom teachers.

New wardens must, therefore, either establish themselves as a "power" within the LEA or establish their credibility with teachers, depending upon their status at the time of initial appointment. Sensitivity to this potential conflict of interest makes or breaks the warden, - and the center.

No definitive study of warden activity has been conducted although the N.U.T. conducted a survey of teacher center wardens in 1971[7] to assess warden wages and conditions of employment. Because the survey produced only a 35 percent response, it has not been widely disseminated or quoted. Nevertheless, the pattern of warden activity suggested by the survey indicates that wardens concentrate their efforts on administration of courses, organization for local curriculum development, and exhibitions, and place lesser emphasis on social activities, national curriculum

projects and liaison with institutions of higher education. Other activities identified by the survey include developing center resources, visiting schools, and making arrangements for study groups and conferences.

A 1971 newspaper account of teacher centers also emphasized the great differences in center activity but noted that wardens stimulate new curriculum development, administer center operations, "facilitate whatever teachers ask for," and "organize cozy tea gatherings."(9) The Master of Philosophy thesis referred to above may shed additional light on the warden's role when it becomes available.

The foregoing summaries and personal observations indicate that the warden's job is extremely demanding - physically, intellectually and emotionally. The interpersonal relationships that must be established between warden and teachers, heads, advisors, other LEA officials, unions, and college and university faculty demands the warden's presence in schools, at professional meetings and conferences, at college and university lectures and social gatherings, and for long hours of the day and evening at the teacher center. (It is not unusual for wardens to devote 60 hours per week to the job, including weekends.) As a coordinator of inservice education, the warden must be sensitive to the wishes of teachers, "heads" and LEA advisors, and must frequently plan program activities to give due regard to each sector of the LEA enterprise. Obviously, wardens must keep abreast of educational developments so that they will know whom to approach to lead specific inservice activities.

IV. Center Goals and Functions

Centers have been established either as Subject Centers serving secondary-school teachers with special disciplinary interests, or Multi-Purpose Centers serving both primary and secondary teachers with a variety of curriculum interests and pedagogic needs. Multi-Purpose Centers exist in far greater numbers than Subject Centers, are better housed and equipped, better budgeted, and serve a

larger number of teachers. (Because Multi-Purpose Centers seem to be attracting and serving primary school teachers to a far greater extent than secondary school teachers - there are exceptions - some thought is being given to the establishment of Multi-Subject Centers to attract larger numbers of secondary teachers working in comprehensive high schools.)

Teacher centers were established to serve the needs of curriculum reform in British primary and secondary education. Schools Council Working Paper #10 introduces the concept as follows:

> "The Council's intention in this paper is to offer suggestions about those facilities which could best support curriculum development on a local basis. While such facilities would clearly be of value for other purposes, particularly for in-service training, this paper will confine its attention to the support of new work." (p. 1)

Working Paper #10 defines the broad objectives of teacher centers as threefold: a) focusing local teacher interest on new objectives, new developments and new ideas in primary and secondary education, whether these innovations are locally developed or developed elsewhere; b) participating in local field trials of new curriculum developments, and contributing to the evaluation and modification of proposed curricular innovations; and c) keeping teachers informed about local and national curriculum development, regardless of whether or not they are participating in any formal field trials or other curriculum development activity. In addition, the Schools Council notes that centers will necessarily need to engage teachers in a variety of inservice training programs in order to equip them for their roles in curriculum development, evaluation and dissemination. Finally, Working Paper #10 notes that the establishment of centers serving the full range of curriculum activity will necessarily create an organization or facility that could enter into cooperative working relationships with other

education agencies and institutions for teacher education in general. The British teacher center, therefore, involves teachers in school reform by seeking their advice on required curriculum change, by engaging them in curriculum development and evaluation, and by offering facilities and services to equip and support them in this effort.

A. The Inservice Focus of Teacher Center Programs

It is clear from the foregoing description that teacher centers are designed to meet the needs of in-service teachers, not pre-service teachers. Little or no teacher center activity is directed towards pre-service education, although some centers assist new teachers, and particularly probationary teachers, to become acclimated to their LEA environment and school responsibilities. The role of the teacher center as an induction mechanism for newly appointed is presently being explored by a number of wardens and has been studied by the James Committee. Pre-service teacher education, however, is the responsibility of Colleges and Institutes of Education.

Teacher centers do not contribute to licensure or certification procedures, nor are they staffed to engage in formal, systematic research or evaluation. Certification seems to be a Local Education Authority decision, and research is the responsibility of University Institutes. The focus of the teacher center is practical in-service education. The teacher centers are concerned with enabling teachers to function more effectively on the job, and this emphasis is translated into concrete, practical courses of study with immediate pay-off in the local school or classroom setting. Educational theory is discussed only as a by-product of more fundamental practical concerns. Nor is teaching or teacher behavior per se subject to rigorous scientific analysis. The concepts and skills comprising the teacher center curriculum are derived from the presumed cognitive, affective, and psychomotor demands of specific curriculum units. The concepts are typically

subject-matter concepts and the skills are subject-matter skills or motor skills required in the use of instructional equipment, e.g., audio-visual equipment or science laboratory equipment. The study of questioning techniques or verbal and non-verbal reinforcement strategies, for example, is presently outside the scope of teacher center in-service education - although some wardens are intrigued by the possibilities and would appreciate opportunities to field test available teacher education materials. In general, then, it is fair to characterize teacher center in-service training as highly pragmatic, locally determined, immediately relevant instruction in the subject-matter of the primary or secondary school curriculum, and in curriculum materials, resources and techniques - a most appropriate emphasis or orientation for school district in-service teacher education. (See Appendix D for examples of teacher center in-service programs and products)

B. The Social Function

Teacher centers do support social activities. Almost all teacher centers have kitchen facilities and lounges. Tea or coffee is usually available any time during the day and always before afternoon or evening courses. The lounge and kitchen facility serves to create an informal atmosphere for group discussions or workshops and as an incentive for teachers to meet and develop a sense of colleagueship. Reducing teacher isolation and creating informal work environments are two highly prized objectives of teacher center activity. As one warden put it, "The fact that the second person hired in this center was Mrs._____to help pour tea, shows that British teachers have their priorities right." It should be noted, incidentally, that centers receive no funds for "tea service," and are expected themselves to provide whatever refreshments are made available.

C. Dissemination Activity

One of the teacher centers' major functions is to display locally prepared or commercially available teaching materials. Depending upon available space, centers allocate rooms and walls to the presentation of books, audio-visual materials and equipment, university or publisher catalogues, announcements of special events - lectures, exhibits, demonstrations, seminars, workshops - and student products. Centers also display new curriculum materials. Frequently observed exhibits highlighted environmental education, the metric system, reading materials for slow learners and the creative arts and crafts. Centers also exhibit new science equipment and classroom furniture, and many centers maintain libraries of children's literature and other student texts. Dissemination is a high priority program and is usually well done.

In fulfilling their dissemination function, centers have had to resolve two major issues: a) the center's role as a censor of available materials by the selection or non-selection of particular materials for display purposes, and b) the center's role as a delivery system for Schools Council materials and equipment. The first issue is obvious and has been resolved by the display of all materials with the notice that the center neither endorses nor critizes their use. The second issue has been a little more difficult to handle. Because the Schools Council is principally funded by LEAs and partially governed by LEA and teacher union representatives, the Schools Council is conducting studies and developing materials presumably with the advice and consent of classroom teachers. The semi-official status of the Schools Council, however, conflicts with the declared independence of teacher centers and the curricular autonomy of school heads and teachers. Centers cannot, therefore, be perceived as delivering the "party-line." Although this issue is not completely resolved, wardens have handled the conflict

by disseminating all reports and displaying all materials, but offering equal time and equal space to other publications and reports.

In addition to the problems of advocacy and censorship, dissemination activities present the problem of cost. Although dissemination is a significant dimension of a center's mandated curriculum reform program, centers may not be adequately funded for the display of national curriculum development efforts. If national curriculum projects do not fund dissemination activities, centers must tap their own resources to cover display expenses. The cost of display, therefore, poses a significant problem. Consequently, wardens have recommended to their local Schools Councils that its curriculum development budget provide for center dissemination activities.

Thus, it may be observed that teacher centers are engaged in a variety of curriculum development and dissemination activities and offer a number of formal and informal courses to serve local in-service education needs. The teacher center program is pragmatic, serving immediate or short-range local needs, and these programs are frequently initiated by and directed by classroom teachers. But just as variability characterizes the nature of teacher center space, facilities, personnel, governance and budget, so, too, is variability the hallmark of teacher center program priorities.

V. Evaluation

Despite considerable LEA investment in teacher center operations, no formal evaluation of the effectiveness of teacher center activities has been conducted. There is no hard evidence of the impact of teacher center inservice education on teacher behavior. Similarly, there are no data concerning the effects of teacher center curriculum development activity on either major transformations of the school curriculum, or improvement in pupil performance in designated areas of the primary or secondary school curriculum. And there appears to be no plan for any systematic evaluations of teacher center operations in the near future.

Several factors may account for the lack of evaluation activities or plans. In part, the failure to engage in or plan for teacher center evaluation may be due

to insufficient funds. Given tight economic circumstances, the careful expansion of teacher center operations may enjoy greater local priority than the rigorous appraisal of limited programs. Secondly, many teacher centers are relatively new, having been established only within the past year or two. Some LEAs, therefore, may not have had the time, either to plan for evaluation, or to budget the cost.

Although financial considerations play a role in the planning and conduct of formal evaluations, other factors seem to be of greater significance. Among these, the most compelling seems to be a lack of faith in objective testing and distrust of formal evaluation procedures. British school personnel, like many of their American counterparts, prefer to rely upon their professional, albeit informal, assessments, rather than rigorous objective evaluations. The English system of paying teachers on the basis of pupil performance, commonplace in the early 20th century, is too painfully fresh in memory to invite similar appraisals of teacher center (or teacher) effectiveness.

A fourth factor contributing to the absence of formal evaluation is the seeming inexperience of teacher center and LEA personnel with evaluation procedures. The tendency to equate evaluation with multiple-choice testing suggests a limited perspective on possible approaches to data collection and analysis. Perhaps a closer working relationship with university or other educational measurement specialists would foster greater understanding and appreciation of the range of evaluation procedures applicable to LEA and teacher center operations.

Finally, LEA and teacher center staff seem unaccustomed to systematic analysis of teacher competencies, and unfamiliar with systematic observational procedures for describing and analyzing changes in teacher behavior. It might be useful for LEA and teacher center personnel to study prototypes of teacher behavior classification systems. Perhaps future teacher center conferences, study groups and workshops might profitably explore the use of systematic observational techniques in the analysis and improvement of teacher behavior.

Although no formal evaluation has been conducted, teacher center wardens and others continually evaluate the effectiveness of teacher center program. Wardens evaluate their efforts by the number of teachers who visit the center and by the comments of teachers, heads and advisors whom they happen to meet. "Voting with their feet" is the way teachers evaluate center activities. If teachers turn out in large numbers, the warden is pleased. If the numbers are small, or if the proportion of teachers reached is low, efforts are made to discover the cause or causes of dissatisfaction, and corrective action is taken. Although teacher attendance may not attest to center effectiveness, teacher absence clearly implies center failure.

On the whole, wardens believe they are doing as well as can be expected, given limitations of space and budget. A number of wardens reported that they are reaching approximately 75 per cent of their teacher populations (average of 1500 teachers per center) but 40-50 per cent might be a more realistic appraisal. (It should be noted that data concerning teacher center operations are largely unavailable. Perhaps Schools Council should assist centers in establishing an institutional research program or participating in a Schools Council-sponsored institutional research effort.)

Although wardens express satisfaction with teacher center progress, they decry the lack of adequate space, personnel and equipment. Many, moreover, feel the need for greater clarification of their roles and the roles of teacher centers. Nevertheless, despite a variety of constraints and uncertainties, wardens express great satisfaction with their jobs and with the progress of their centers.

University professors seem to react positively to the teacher center movement, although they are disappointed by the separation of centers from colleges and universities. They are not, however, concerned about teacher center displacement of university functions. On the contrary, the teacher center movement is seen as

whetting the appetites of teachers for more scholarly study, and increasing demands on university personnel and resources.

School administrators seemed to be as enthusiastic as wardens in their assessment of center operations. Administrators regard centers as major resources for local curriculum development and in-service education. With the decentralization of curricular authority to school heads and teachers, administrators must rely on in-service education to achieve school reform. Teacher centers, therefore, are valued not only by wardens and teachers, but also by LEA advisors and other school district officials.

The reaction of the N.U.T. is, surprisingly, unclear. On the one hand, the National Union of Teachers regards the teacher center as the teachers' "home away from home," supports teacher control, and advocates N.U.T. participation in teacher center governance. On the other hand, the N.U.T. has not officially supported the expansion of the teacher center movement. The N.U.T. views in-service education as part of a continuum of professional preparation and development, and teacher centers appear, in their judgement, in adequate responses to a continuous sequence of pre-service and in-service education. The N.U.T. seems to regard teacher center development as a piecemeal response to the pressing need for a highly articulated structure of professional development. Further, because teacher centers vary so widely in facilities, personnel and program priorities, the N.U.T. seems to view them as local responses to local needs, not necessarily a national response to a national need. Whether the N.U.T. will limit advocacy to participation in local teacher center activities or whether it will shift to national advocacy is uncertain. Much will depend on the N.U.T.'s assessment of the short-run likelihood of attaining degree preparation requirements and post-graduate in-service education for all teachers - a development which would markedly enhance the professional (and financial) status of all educational personnel. But, with N.U.T.-affiliated wardens pressing for greater advocacy, the N.U.T. may shift to teacher center

advocacy as one plank in its platform to upgrade the status of school personnel.

Teacher reaction to teacher centers is extremely positive. To be sure, some teachers acknowledge that they have little use for a center because they are attending programs at universities, or because they have no interest in the center's social program. Most teachers, however, desire both the in-service education program and the social opportunity. Teachers regard the center's emphasis on practical, immediately relevant curriculum development as extremely useful in their day-to-day planning and teaching. Access to the center's equipment and facilities, e.g., rexographing equipment and meeting room accommodations, is also highly valued. The center appears to be useful to different teachers for different reasons, each equally legitimate, each warranting teacher support. Head teachers, moreover, also view the center positively, even though they incur staffing problems when teachers are released during school hours to participate in center programs.

Despite the lack of formal evaluation, reaction to teacher centers appears positive. No educational constituency has expressed strong negative reaction, although university faculty may criticize the centers' non-affiliation with existing academic institutions, the N.U.T. position is unclear, and some "heads" balk at releasing teachers for center activity during the school day.

VI. Applicability to the United States

The determination of the relevance of the British teacher center model to American teacher education and school reform must take into account a comparison of the needs to be served and resources available in the United States and in the United Kingdom. This comparison presupposes the utility of the model as it operates to meet the needs of English education. As has been noted, there is no hard evidence supporting the effectiveness of the model in England, and although informal reactions tend to be positive, the James Report and the official reticence of the National Union of Teachers place the presupposition in doubt, and for the same

reason; the model is not responsive to the need for a continuous sequence of preservice and inservice education.

It can be argued, however, that the model was not intended to serve the need for a fully articulated program of preservice and continuing education, but rather to engage teachers in the inservice education activities essential to curriculum reform. Admitting this more limited objective, the presupposition of teacher center utility has greater plausibility, although it cannot be emphasized too strongly that evidence relating curriculum reform to teacher center operations is unavailable. Nevertheless, for purposes of this discussion, it is assumed that the curriculum reform strategy of the British teacher center model is valid under the circumstances and conditions in which it operates in the United Kingdom. Obviously the question of utility arises from the assumption that public funds will be required to establish and maintain the center. If private funding sources are to carry the enterprise, or if teachers themselves are to support the center, the question of value in terms of the public interest is not as critical. Other questions of interest to the private sector, or of interest to teachers, will assume higher priority. In the present paper, the applicability of the model to the United States also presupposes public support similar to that which obtains in England and Wales. The plausibility of this assumption in the United States bears directly on the transportability of the model.

Before considering the applicability of the British teacher center to the United States, it is useful to summarize the major elements of the model, recognizing that diversity characterizes their physical and functional properties.

1. The British teacher center is a facility providing space, materials and equipment in which

a. Teachers engage in curriculum planning and development activity and receive instruction pertinent to the design, development and implementation of primary and secondary school curricula;

b. the products of local and national curriculum development activities are exhibited; and

c. teachers convene for purposes of relaxation and refreshment.

2. Centers serve approximately 1000 teachers and are located to afford teachers easy access during or after school hours. The location of a center also takes into account access to LEA, college and university personnel and resources. The availability of space, however, is usually the determining factor in the center's location.

3. The teacher center employs a number of full-time and part-time staff for purposes of administration, instruction, technical assistance, secretarial/clerical assistance, and custodial care. The staff typically includes:

a. a full-time professional educator serving in the capacity of administrative head;

b. one additional professional educator, full-time or part-time, serving as deputy or assistant administrative head;

c. a full-time secretary, and one or more clerical assistants on a full-time or part-time basis;

d. a full-time or part-time media (audio-visual) technician;

e. a full-time or part-time librarian;

f. a full-time or part-time housekeeper and custodian; and

g. professional and technical consultants, on a temporary basis for curriculum planning, development, and evaluation, for in-service education, or for display and dissemination activities, as necessary.

4. The teacher center budget is provided by the local school district from public funds. The budget covers all personnel, facilities, materials and equipment except the costs of refreshments. In addition, the center has access to the personnel and material resources of the local school district on a cost basis.

5. The center is governed by an advisory committee including teachers, school administrators, college and university faculty, and teacher center administrative staff. Teachers may "control" the center.

6. The center program is initiated by teachers, school administrators, or teacher center staff, but teacher participation in the center program is purely voluntary. The program is highly pragmatic and immediately relevant to the instructional responsibilities of teachers in the local center area. Although most centers conduct programs for primary and secondary school teachers, some centers specialize in programs for particular subject-matter teachers, usually at the secondary level.

The foregoing summary of teacher center goals, facilities, personnel and resources enables assessment of the generalizability of the British model in terms of American educational needs, costs, and values. To place the matter in perspective, it is useful to begin with cost estimates for replicating the British model on American soil, and specifically, in New York City. (It should be noted that the estimates below are rough and may be in error by as much as 25 per cent in either direction.)

Assuming a location in a modest rental area, and estimating 75 square feet of space per teacher occupant and 100 occupants at a given time, yields a rental need of approximately 7500 square feet. At $5.00 per square foot, the rental cost is $37,500 annually.

Assuming a full-time director at $25,000 per annum, a full-time secretary at $8,500, a half-time deputy director at $10,000, a half-time media specialist at $7,500, a half-time librarian at $7,500, custodial/housekeeping services at $7,500, part-time clerical assistance at $6,000, and consultants at $25,000, the operating budget for personnel is almost $100,000. Add to salaries another $15,000 for fringe benefits, and the cost for personnel is approximately $115,000 per annum.

Assuming expendable office supplies and materials at $3,000 per year, telephone service at $2,500, educational materials at $5,000, duplicating materials and services at $5,000, postage at $1,500, and travel for center staff and consultants at

$3,500, yields an annual other-than-personal-service budget of approximately $20,000.

Assuming a one-time expenditure of $5,000 for office furniture for five full-time equivalent staff members, a one-time expenditure for lounge chairs, tables, lamps, and rugs at $10,000, audio-visual equipment at $5,000, library shelves and filing equipment at $5,000, lecture hall tables and chairs at $6,000, seminar tables and chairs for five rooms at $7,500, a media resource center at $2,500, and bulletin boards, chalk boards, and other display materials and equipment at $2,500, yields a one-time expenditure for permanent equipment of approximately $45,000. Prorating this expenditure over a five-year life yields an annual expenditure of $9,000 for permanent equipment and material.

Assuming the one-time installation of kitchen facilities and bar equipment at $5,000 and the one-time installation of floor coverings, wall paper or paint and decorative accessories at $15,000, yields an additional expenditure of $20,000, or another $4,000 per year over five years.

The total annual expenditure for a teacher center serving approximately 1,000 teachers in a modest New York City rental area approaches $200,000, or a per teacher expenditure of $200 per year. This figure is, admittedly, a guess and is probably an under-estimate. Perhaps $250,000, or $250 per teacher, is a more realistic estimate. It is interesting to note that even at $250.00 per teacher, the expenditure is equivalent to the tuition for a three-credit graduate course at most of the universities in the City of New York. Teachers may be willing to pay the total cost of center operation if they can negotiate with the Board of Education to accept a specified number of teacher center inservice hours of instruction for the salary incremental value of a three-credit graduate course. Or, they might negotiate with the State Education Department to accept a specified number of center instructional hours for credit towards advanced certification. Either (or both) of these negotiated equivalencies of graduate education is further enhanced if the $250 fee is also tax-deductible.

The importance of examining the feasibility of direct teacher funding of teacher center operations is clear. Given the uncertain relationship between teacher center inservice education and school reform, it is most unlikely that tax-levied dollars can be found to support the development of teacher centers in the United States. Nor is the actual dollar investment trivial. In New York City, for example, the cost analysis suggests that an annual expenditure of approximately $15 million would be required to accommodate 60,000 teachers in 60 teacher centers.

On the other hand, 60,000 teachers might generate $15 million if they could negotiate the graduate training equivalencies for salary increment or certification purposes. Moreover, the press for evidence supporting the relationship between teacher center programs and curriculum reform is slightly abated by the shift in fiscal support from the public treasury to the professional pocket.

The public interest in the value of teacher center operations must still, however, be represented in the negotiations for salary increment or certification credit equivalencies. The negotiations might take into account the need for State or professional accreditation of the personnel and material resources underlying the inservice education program in exchange for graduate credit equivalencies, or the negotiation could generate the requirement of a contractual relationship between a teacher center and a college or university to yield graduate credit in return for shared quality control over center inservice operations, access to center facilities and resources, and the cooperative development of school and teacher education curricula. Negotiations with school districts might exchange salary increments for teacher-funded inservice training, or might exchange partial public subsidy of center curriculum projects and inservice programs for the delivery of curriculum materials. The public subsidy of center curriculum development projects could emerge from school district curriculum materials budgets, once the center had established a positive curriculum development track record.

The foregoing cost analysis and observations have made clear that, in at least one respect, the British teacher center model is not transportable to the United States. American teacher centers cannot anticipate LEA funding, but must, instead look to teacher funding and/or public support on a quid pro quo basis. Nor is this an undesirable state. The basis for British LEA funding lies in the complete decentralization of curriculum authority under the control of school heads and classroom teachers. (British teachers enjoy a greater degree of professional autonomy and respect than their American colleagues.) The funding of teacher centers gives LEA authorities access to, and influence over, teacher curriculum development programs. Moreover, despite the assertions of British teacher center wardens that the centers are under "teacher control," the fact of total LEA funding places ultimate control in the hands of LEA officers. If teachers truly value control over center programs and priorities, they will need to assume major responsibility for center operating costs. This is as true for teachers in the United Kingdom as it is for teachers in the United States. The British teacher, however, has an option; he can sacrifice some control over center programs and priorities for he already enjoys a degree of autonomy in school curriculum affairs, and participation in center programs is purely voluntary.

Once the factor of LEA funding is removed, the question of the transportability of the model reduces to whatever elements teachers in the United States regard as desirable and are willing to support. If, for example, teachers in the United States wish to establish centers completely dedicated to social functions, under full teacher funding, they are free to do so. The generalizibility of the model is an important issue only if public funds are to defray all or part of the cost. Under the assumption that the use of public funds is a possibility, it is important to determine which goals and functions of the British teacher center model are educationally defensible within the context of American school and teacher education

structures, resources, predispositions and accomplishments.

The fundamental mission of the British teacher center is to introduce local curriculum reform through locally sponsored inservice education. It has already been noted that the decentralization of curriculum authority virtually dictates LEA (public) funded inservice education as the means of curriculum change. It should also be noted that English colleges of education have been almost exclusively concerned with preservice education, and that university degree programs have admitted limited numbers of teachers to broadly "theoretic" rather than narrowly "pragmatic" courses of study. In brief, English teacher education has developed neither the institutional structures for inservice education nor have colleges of education and university institutes oriented their programs to the job demands of inservice teachers. Moreover, English "certification" requirements do not mandate continuing or graduate education. Once a British teacher has completed a satisfactory probationary year, the teacher is "certified" for life and need never engage in further study, formal or informal. (Many British teachers never do.)

By contrast, American teacher education has developed a tradition of post-baccalaureate inservice education, supported by State certification requirements. This is not to imply that graduate teacher education programs in the United States have effectively met the inservice training requirements of classroom teachers, nor does it imply that graduate teacher education program requirements have generated school reform. (The evidence here, as in England, is difficult to obtain.) On the other hand, American teacher education, both on the undergraduate level and on the graduate (fifth-year) level, has been moving closer and closer to a fully integrated, cost/effective, school-university program of didactic, laboratory, and clinical experiences for teacher preparation and professional development. At least part of the inservice education function of teacher centers can be accommodated

by existing institutional structures and inter-institutional (school-university) arrangements. Moreover, if the workload formula for budgetary support for graduate teacher education were modified, or more funds were made available, colleges and universities could be more responsive to local inservice education needs.

The decision as to whether greater public support for inservice teacher education should be channeled through school districts or higher education is a function of determining whether the public interest in school reform is more effectively and efficiently promoted by challenging the status quo through the intervention of higher education, or challenging the status quo through the immediate accountability of the public schools. The recent history of federal support for both personnel development (EPDA) and school reform (ESEA) is not particularly illuminating. On balance, however, the residue of benefits derived from expenditures on personnel development in higher education would seem to slightly outweigh the value-added residuals of direct investment in school reform. Perhaps a reasonable solution to the problem is the allocation of funds to local districts for the establishment of teacher center facilities, administrative services, materials and equipment, and the allocation of funds to colleges and universities for the delivery of instructional services. The sharing of such allocations to inservice education would require contractual agreements between schools, colleges, and teacher organizations to assure the expenditure of inservice dollars for training programs immediately relevant to teacher needs in the planning, development and institutionalization of curriculum reform. Teacher organizations would need to enter into agreements with schools and colleges because teacher participation in center programs must be assured.

In proposing the allocation formula and contractual arrangements above, it has been tacitly assumed that the strategy of curriculum reform through inservice education is as valid in the United States as it appears to be in the United Kingdom. The

proposal also accepts as valid the establishment of teacher center facilities patterned after English prototypes. The funding formula, however, differs. State or federal funds would be allocated to both schools and colleges in order to preserve the creative tensions between schools, colleges and teacher organizations which is essential to school reform. The public funding formula is a plausible alternative to full teacher funding. But if public funds are sweeter, teacher funds are quicker.

The analysis of the teacher center inservice education program for school reform suggests the desirability of funding a network of teacher centers either by teachers directly, or by a consortium of schools, colleges and teacher organizations. (Teacher organizations or teachers might fund the social activity dimension under the public funding arrangement.) Establishing the centers for inservice education does not preclude the use of the center for curriculum display or dissemination activities. Once the facility is developed, publicly supported curriculum development projects would have an immediate dissemination mechanism. Moreover, curriculum materials developed in the private sector could also be displayed with private sector funding of the cost of exhibition.

In addition to the curriculum development, dissemination, and inservice education emphases, teacher centers could also serve as teacher certification agencies. Assuming State support, teacher centers might function as local clearinghouses to ascertain the certification status of new teachers, to make arrangements for the collection of additional data bearing on a teacher's certification status, and for disseminating information pertinent to certification requirements and programs.

Teacher centers might also serve to induct new teachers into the local school setting through orientation programs sponsored by the center and the local school district, and through a variety of social activities. Furthermore, centers could serve the needs of preservice teacher education by facilitating student teacher assignments. The consortium requirements of the public funding formula insist upon inter-institutional arrangements, not only for curriculum reform, but also for

preservice, induction, and continuing education.

The British teacher center model has relevance for American school reform and teacher education, albeit under different funding formulas. If teacher centers are to be publicly funded, care must be taken at the outset to assure the presence of healthy tension between "what is" and "what might be," between schools and colleges, between public institutions and private organizations. If teachers fund teacher centers directly, future negotiations between the center, the State Education Department, schools and colleges will need to be similarly sensitive to the public interest.

References

1. Curriculum Development: Teachers' Groups and Centers. Working Paper No. 10, Schools Council, London, 1967.

2. Plowden. Children and Their Primary Schools. A report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, London, 1966.

3. Newsom. Half Our Future. A report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, London, 1963.

4. Raising the School Leaving Age: A Cooperative Programme of Research and Development. Working Paper No. 2, Schools Council, London, 1965.

5. List of Teachers' Centres in England and Wales. Schools Council, London, 1972.

6. Teacher Education and Training. A Report by a Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme. London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972.

7. Teachers' Centres: A Survey of Centre Resources and Conditions of Service of Leaders. National Union of Teachers, London, 1972.

8. For further information write to Mr. John Brand, Warden, Hipper Street Teachers Center, Chesterfield, Derbyshire, England.

9. "Centres for Action." The Times Educational Supplement. London, December 17, 1971.

Appendix A

Wardens and Teacher Centers Visited, October, 1972

Wardens	Teacher Centers
Mr. R. Bacon	Melbourne House T.C., Sheffield
Ms. D. Booth	Philadelphia T.C., Sheffield
Mr. J. Brand	Hipper Street T.C., Chesterfield
Mr. M. Y. Davidson	Portswood T.C., Southampton
Mr. D. Goddard	Rachel McMillan T.C., London
Mr. E. R. Millington	Newham T.C., London
Mr. T. A. Priest	South East Derbyshire T.C., Ilkeston
Mr. W. T. Spouge	Huddersfield T.C., Huddersfield
Mr. D. Wren	Longmore T.C., Hertford

Appendix B

University Faculty, LEA and N.U.T. Officials Visited, October, 1972

Ms. A. Banks	Schools Council, London
Mr. F. Jarvis	National Union of Teachers, London
Dr. D. Johnston	Institute of Education, University of London
Mr. G. Long	Sheffield County Education Authority
Mr. L. Plom	Inner London Education Authority
Mr. W. Schiller	Her Majesty's Inspector, London (retired)
Dr. F. Whitehead	Institute of Education, University of Sheffield